



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/024,885	02/17/1998	DAVID ROTH	T1680CIP2	8884

22249 7590 03/28/2002

LYON & LYON LLP
633 WEST FIFTH STREET
SUITE 4700
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071

EXAMINER

ABRAMS, NEIL

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/024885

Applicant(s)

Examiner

N. Abrams

Group Art Unit

2839

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1-29-00 [RCE Transmittal and amendment]

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 80-116

is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) _____

is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____

is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 80-116

is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____

is/are objected to.

☐ Claim(s) _____

are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:

☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____

☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received

in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2839

The filing of an RCE in this case is acknowledged. A first action follows.

Claims 95-106 and 112 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 95, line 6 "the card body" seems incorrect. Claim 112 dependency appears incorrect.

~~Claims 86, 93, 102, 114 are rejected under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph. While applicant may be his or her own lexicographer, a term in a claim may not be given a meaning repugnant to the usual meaning of that term. See *In re Hill*, 161 F.2d 367, 73-401 USPQ 482 (CCPA 1947). The term "86, 93, 102, 114 are" in claim 1. These claims are not based on enabling disclosure and just how they are readable on elected embodiments, figs. 22-25 is unclear is used by the claim to mean " " while the accepted meaning is " "~~

Claims 80-116 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aldous '404 in view of Hardesty, Clarke and Research Disclosure (RD).

See Aldous, figs. 7, 8 card body 46, 40 and receptacle assembly 48. It would have been obvious to form assembly 48 as a unitary housing including parts 52, 50 in view of Hardesty. Clarke and RD.

The fig. 7 assembly 48 is basically an adapter. The formation of adapters as unitary bodies like that of RD is well known in the art and the use of such structure would not have been ~~an~~ unobvious.

Art Unit: 2839

For fig. 8, it would have been obvious to use an adapter like 48 but appropriately formed for use with cavity 36 and used for addition of circuit parts or for change of plug in direction as in RD, figs. 1, 2. Claim 95 "dimensions....differs" as broadly stated does not overcome use of RD type adapter.


For claims 85, 92 etc, it would have been obvious to use an adapter to provide recesses for plural telephone plugs or lines in view of Clarke and Hardesty.

This basis of rejection is maintained since no new results have been shown to be derived from use of plural lines in a computer card body. If such results are present they should be discussed in the response.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to N. Abrams at telephone number (703) 308-1729.

Abrams/ds

03/23/02


N. ABRAMS
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 322